

**STATE FOREST LAND
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

Purpose of Checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for Applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can. *Questions in italics are supplemental to Ecology's standard environmental checklist. They have been added by the DNR to assist in the review of state forest land proposals. Adjacency and landscape/watershed-administrative-unit (WAU) maps for this proposal are available on the DNR internet website at <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under "SEPA Center." These maps may also be reviewed at the DNR regional office responsible for the proposal. This checklist is to be used for SEPA evaluation of state forest land activities.*

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later. *All of the questions are intended to address the complete proposal as described by your response to question A-11. The proposal acres in question A-11 may cover a larger area than the forest practice application acres, or the actual timber sale acres.*

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NON PROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer" and "affected geographic area," respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Timber Sale Name: **SLEEPY**

Agreement #: **30-077329**
2. Name of applicant: **Washington Department of Natural Resources**
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:
**Charlie McKinney (509) 925-8510
713 Bowers Rd
Ellensburg, WA 98926**
4. Date checklist prepared: **12/22/2005**
5. Agency requesting checklist: **Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR)**
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):
 - a. *Auction Date:* **Winter 2006**
 - b. *Planned contract end date (but may be extended):* **Winter 2007**
 - c. *Phasing:* **N/A**
7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

Timber Sale
 - a. *Site preparation:* **Slash piles may be burned to reduce fuel loading.**
 - b. *Regeneration Method:* **Hand planting of Douglas-fir seedlings.**
 - c. *Vegetation Management:* **None.**
 - d. *Thinning:* **None.**

Roads: **None.**

Rock Pits and/or Sale: **None.**

Other: **None.**

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.
- ☐ 303 (d) – listed water body in WAU: ☐temp ☐sediment ☐completed TMDL (total maximum daily load):
- ☐Landscape plan:
- ☐Watershed analysis:
- ☐Interdisciplinary team (ID Team) report:
- ☒Road design plan:
- ☒Wildlife report: **SE Region Biologist**
- ☐Geotechnical report:
- ☒Other specialist report(s): **DNR Cultural Resources Survey.**
- ☐Memorandum of understanding (sportsmen’s groups, neighborhood associations, tribes, etc.):
- ☐Rock pit plan:
- ☒Other: **Policy for Sustainable Forests: Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) adopted July 31, 1992 & DNR Habitat Conservation Plan, adopted January 30, 1997, HCP Amendment #1 for the Klickitat HCP Planning Unit April 2004.**

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.
None known.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.
- ☐HPA ☒Burning permit ☐Shoreline permit ☒Incidental take permit ☒FPA # **2703685** ☐Other:

11. Give brief, complete description of our proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include specific information on project description.)

a. Complete proposal description:

The Sleepy Timber Sale is comprised of two timber harvest units totaling approximately 127 acres within the Panakanic and Major Creek WAU’s. The proposal area was selected from nearly 226 acres considered for the sale. An area of approximately 80 acres to the northeast of Unit #1 of this proposal was excluded from the sale due to the immaturity and operational infeasibility of the stand. A smaller portion of timber to the west was also considered, but was excluded due to the immaturity of the timber. Furthermore, an area of approximately 8 acres to the northwest of Unit #2 of this proposal was excluded from the sale due to the immaturity of the timber. These areas will be reviewed for harvest at a later date. Approximately 3,996 MMBF of timber will be removed as a result of this proposal. Both units are to be regeneration harvested, leaving approximately 6-11 trees per acre as shade/protection for advance regeneration, legacy trees, wildlife cover, snag/down woody debris recruitment, future stand structure, and as a natural seed source for the future stand. Leave trees consist primarily of Douglas-fir, with scattered grand fir individuals. The units are to be planted with Douglas-fir seedlings following harvest. The entire sale area will be logged using ground based equipment. A 600-foot spur of new construction will be built in Unit 2 to facilitate operations.

The proposal is within the Klickitat Scattered Sub-Landscape and is designated as Desired Future Condition (DFC)/No Role in support of the Northern Spotted Owl. In accordance with HCP Amendment #1 this proposal will be managed for sustainability under DFC guidelines, and consistent with DNR policies. Further objectives for this proposal include, but are not limited to: generating revenue for the State Forest Board trust, retaining wildlife and green recruitment trees for the purpose of wildlife cover and habitat, increasing the overall health and vigor of the stands for future production, and to provide a diversified age class across the landscape.

No Douglas fir, ponderosa pine or wesern larch trees 28” DBH or larger and 160 years of age or older will be harvested as part of this proposal. Increment boring of larger older trees shows a stand age of approximately 105 years old.

b. Timber stand description pre-harvest (include major timber species and origin date), type of harvest, overall unit objectives.

The current stands are dominated by a 100+ year old mixture of Douglas-fir and grand fir. The stand density is variable throughout the unit, and is characterized by scattered patches of large diameter remnants along with patches of younger timber (50+ years old). The average diameter of the stand ranges from approximately 16-20 inches, excluding large diameter remnants. Slopes average 10-15% over the sale area.

c. Road activity summary. See also forest practice application (FPA) for maps and more details.

Type of Activity	How Many	Length (feet) (Estimated)	Acres (Estimated)	Fish Barrier Removals (#)
Construction		595	.5	N/A
Reconstruction		N/A		N/A
Abandonment		N/A	N/A	N/A
Bridge Install/Replace	N/A			N/A
Culvert Install/Replace (fish)	N/A			N/A
Culvert Install/Replace (no fish)	N/A			

12. Location of proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist. (See timber sale map. See also color landscape/WAU map on the DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “SEPA Center.”)

a. Legal description: **Parts of Section 20 and 29, Township 4 North, Range 12 East, W.M. in Klickitat County.**

b. Distance and direction from nearest town (include road names):

The proposal is located approximately 10 miles northeast of White Salmon, WA via the Lyle-Snowden Road.

- c. Identify the watershed administrative unit (WAU), the WAU Sub-basin(s), and acres. (See also landscape/WAU map on DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “SEPA Center.”)

WAU Name	WAU Acres	Proposal Acres
PANAKANIC	37953	72
MAJOR CREEK	40556	55

The proposal is not within any areas of Resource Sensitivity identified by the Panakanic Watershed Analysis.

13. Discuss any known future activities not associated with this proposal that may result in a cumulative change in the environment when combined with the past and current proposal(s). (See digital ortho-photos for WAU and adjacency maps on DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “SEPA Center” for a broader landscape perspective.)

Panakanic WAU: This proposal is located at approximately 2600 feet elevation within the rain-on-snow zone of the Panakanic WAU. Across the WAU, according to the DNR’s GIS Forest Practice Application data base as of December 22, 2005, in the past 7 years, there have been approximately 7561 acres of timber approved for harvest within the WAU. By Forest Practice definition, 3621 acres have been approved for even aged harvest, 3940 acres have been approved for uneven aged harvest. DNR manages 21% of the land in the Panakanic WAU. 79% of the WAU falls under private ownership . Of the total acres of DNR lands approved for harvest in the WAU, 178 acres were even aged harvested and 36 acres were uneven age harvested.

Major Creek WAU: Across the WAU, according to the DNR’s GIS Forest Practice Application data base as of December 22, 2005, in the past 7 years, there have been approximately 2233 acres of timber approved for harvest within the WAU. By Forest Practice definition, 915 acres have been approved for even aged harvest, 1318 acres have been approved for uneven aged harvest. DNR manages 10% of the land in the Major Creek WAU. 89% of the WAU falls under private ownership, and the remaining 1% is owned by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Of the total acres of DNR lands approved for harvest in the WAU, 124 acres were even aged harvested and 5 acres were uneven age harvested.

Discussion: Forested lands currently being managed by the DNR for timber production within the WAU’s should have minimal cumulative impacts across the WAU’s. See Sections B.1.h, B.3.a.2, B.3.a.3, B.3.a.5, B.3.a.7, B.3.a.9, B.3.c.1, and B.3.d. Approximately 6 trees per acre in Unit #2 and 11 trees per acre in Unit #1 will be left. Leave trees are both scattered and clumped throughout the units. To assure that this proposal will not contribute to an increased chance of cumulative environmental impact, many protection measures have been included in the proposal. New road construction has been minimized, and maintenance specifications outlined in the Road Plan will ensure that run-off will be dispersed on to the forest floor on all DNR roads used for this proposal. Water bars and placement of slash on skid trails (where operable) are expected to minimize soil erosion within harvest units. Steep slopes have been bounded out of the sale area, and the gentle slopes within harvest units have reduced the probability of any mass wasting potential.

No increases to peak flows or other resource impacts are anticipated as a result of the Sleepy proposal in combination with all other timber, range, recreation or agricultural management across all ownerships within the Panakanic and Major Creek WAU’s.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

- a. General description of the site (check one):

☐ Flat, ☐ Rolling, ☒ Hilly, ☐ Steep Slopes, ☐ Mountainous, ☐ Other:

- 1) General description of the WAU or sub-basin(s) (landforms, climate, elevations, and forest vegetation zone).

PANAKANIC WAU: The general terrain of the WAU includes flat benches, bluffs, mountainous steep slopes, and valleys with slopes averaging 2-70 percent. Precipitation within the WAU averages about 42 inches a year. Elevations range from 294 to 3034 feet. Major timber types include Douglas-fir and Douglas-fir/ponderosa pine.

Major Creek WAU: The general terrain of the WAU includes flat benches, bluffs, mountainous steep slopes, and valleys with slopes averaging 2-70 percent. Precipitation within the WAU averages about 40 inches a year. Elevations range from 70 to 2782 feet. Major timber types include Douglas-fir and Douglas-fir/ponderosa pine.

- 2) Identify any difference between the proposal location and the general description of the WAU or sub-basin(s).

The proposal is located at approximately 2600 feet.

- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?
Approximately 40% slope over 1% of the proposal area.
- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland. *Note: The following table is created from state soil survey data. It is a roll-up of general soils information for the soils found in the entire sale area. It is only one of several site assessment tools used in conjunction with actual site inspections for slope stability concerns or erosion potential. It can help indicate potential for shallow, rapid soil movement, but often does not represent deeper soil sub-strata. The actual soils conditions in the sale area may vary considerably based on land-form shapes, presence of erosive situations, and other factors. The state soil survey is a compilation of various surveys with different standards.*

State Soil Survey #	Soil Texture or Soil Complex Name	% Slope	Acres	Mass Wasting Potential	Erosion Potential
6230	LOAM	8-15	93	INSIGNIFIC'T	MEDIUM
4853	LOAM	8-15	27	INSIGNIFIC'T	LOW
6231	LOAM	15-30	5	INSIGNIFIC'T	MEDIUM
6045	GRAVELLY LOAM	30-50	2	LOW	HIGH

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

1) *Surface indications:*

There were no observable surface indications of unstable soils within the immediate vicinity of the proposal.

2) *Is there evidence of natural slope failures in the sub-basin(s)?*

☒No ☐Yes, type of failures (shallow vs. deep-seated) and failure site characteristics:

3) *Are there slope failures in the sub-basin(s) associated with timber harvest activities or roads?*

☐No ☒Yes, type of failures (shallow vs. deep-seated) and failure site characteristics:

Associated management activity:

Small localized shallow events can be found along cut banks of main county roads and other roads within the WAU. These consist primarily of sloughing of material into ditches and occasionally onto road surfaces, and may be attributed to road construction and maintenance activities.

4) *Is the proposed site similar to sites where slope failures have occurred previously in the sub-basin(s)?*

☐No ☒Yes, describe similarities between the conditions and activities on these sites:

Sites and soil types located within this proposal are similar to other small local shallow events within the WAU's as described above in B.1.d.3.

5) *Describe any slope stability protection measures (including sale boundary location, road, and harvest system decisions) incorporated into this proposal.*

None.

e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

Approx. acreage new roads: 0 Approx. acreage new landings: 1 Fill source: N/A

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

Due to the lack of surface water and the relatively flat terrain of the proposal area, the potential for soil erosion is expected to be low. This sale was designed to conform to or exceed Forest Practice regulations. Management techniques have been identified where appropriate to minimize or eliminate the risk of erosion. Please refer to B.1.h. for management activities designed to minimize erosion.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)? *Approximate percent of proposal in permanent road running surface (includes gravel roads):* **None.**

h. Propose measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

(Include protection measures for minimizing compaction or rutting.)

Although the proposal area is nearly flat (slopes average 10-15%), harvest units have been designed with slope stability protection measures in mind. Leave trees have been scattered and/or clumped throughout the units to aid in soil/stability. The units will be planted with Douglas-fir seedlings following harvest. Roads will be maintained to allow for proper drainage as prescribed in Forest Practice rules. Proper road maintenance, designated skid trails, effective contract administration, and Department road maintenance practices are expected to minimize most erosion potential. Water bars, ditching and outsloping will be utilized. All proposed measures will meet or exceed Forest Practice regulations. Main skid trails will be water barred or have slash scattered on them where operable as determined by the Contract Administrator. Haul will not occur during the wet weather season (November 1 to April 30).

2. Air

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust from truck traffic, rock mining, crushing or hauling, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

This proposed timber harvest will involve vehicle emissions from logging, yarding, and hauling equipment; dust from harvest and log hauling activities. Such emissions should result in minimal impact to air quality. If burning slash piles occurs, it will adhere to the State's Smoke Management Program.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe. **None.**

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any: **None.**

3. Water

a. Surface:

1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into. *(See timber sale map and forest practice base maps.)*

There are no surface water bodies within the proposal.

a) *Downstream water bodies:*

Mill Creek is approximately .25 miles to the north of the proposal.

b) Complete the following riparian & wetland management zone table:

Wetland, Stream, Lake, Pond, or Saltwater Name (if any)	Water Type	Number (how many?)	Avg RMZ/WMZ Width in Feet (per side for streams)
N/A	--	--	--

c) List RMZ/WMZ protection measures including silvicultural prescriptions, road-related RMZ/WMZ protection measures, and wind buffers.

None.

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) to the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.
☒No ☐Yes (See RMZ/WMZ table above and timber sale map.)
Description (include culverts):

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

None.

- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. (Include diversions for fish-passage culvert installation.)
☒No ☐Yes, description:
- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.
☒No ☐Yes, describe location:
- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.
☒No ☐Yes, type and volume:
- 7) Does the sub-basin contain soils or terrain susceptible to surface erosion and/or mass wasting? What is the potential for eroded material to enter surface water?

Yes, areas within the WAU’s may be susceptible to erosion. The potential for eroded material to enter surface water is expected to be minimal due to a lack of surface water courses within the proposal area. Mitigation measures designed to limit soil erosion can be found in B.1.5.h.

- 8) Is there evidence of changes to the channels in the WAU and sub-basin(s) due to surface erosion or mass wasting (accelerated aggradations, erosion, decrease in large organic debris (LOD), change in channel dimensions)?
☒No ☐Yes, describe changes and possible causes:
- 9) Could this proposal affect water quality based on the answers to the questions 1-8 above?
☒No ☐Yes, explain:
- 10) What are the approximate road miles per square mile in the WAU and sub-basin(s)?
Are you aware of areas where forest roads or road ditches intercept sub-surface flow and deliver surface water to streams, rather than back to the forest floor?
☒No ☐Yes, describe:

Road miles per square mile within the Panakanic WAU and sub-basin is 3.6 miles.
Road miles per square mile within the Major Creek WAU and sub-basin is 3 miles.

- 11) Is the proposal within a significant rain-on-snow (ROS) zone? If not, **STOP HERE** and go to question B-3-a-13 below. Use the WAU or sub-basin(s) for the ROS percentage questions below.
☐No ☒Yes, approximate percent of WAU in significant ROS zone.
Approximate percent of sub-basin(s):

Approximately 67% of the Panakanic WAU is within the significant ROS zone.
Approximately 45% of the Major Creek WAU is within the significant ROS zone.

- 12) If the proposal is within the significant ROS zone, what is the approximate percentage of the WAU or sub-basin(s) within the significant ROS zone (all ownerships) that is (are) rated as hydrologically mature?

The following percentages were generated from Landsat Data collected in 1988:

Approximately 61% of the ROS Zone of the Panakanic WAU is rated as hydrologically mature.
Approximately 56% of the ROS Zone of the Major Creek WAU is rated as hydrologically mature.

- 13) Is there evidence of changes to channels associated with peak flows in the WAU or sub-basin(s)?
☒No ☐Yes, describe observations:
- 14) Based on your answers to questions B-3-a-10 through B-3-a-13 above, describe whether and how this proposal, in combination with other past, current, or reasonably foreseeable proposals in the WAU and sub-basin(s), may contribute to a peak flow impact.

Due to mitigating factors for this proposal such as harvest location and layout, harvest prescription, road maintenance practices, and operating season restrictions, this proposal is not expected to contribute to increased peak flows. There is no evidence that this proposal will contribute to a runoff or peak flow problem.

- 15) *Is there water resource (public, domestic, agricultural, hatchery, etc.), or area of slope instability, downstream or downslope of the proposed activity that could be affected by changes in surface water amounts, quality, or movements as a result of this proposal?*
☒No ☐Yes, possible impacts:
- 16) *Based on your answers to questions B-3-a-10 through B-3-a-15 above, note any protection measures addressing possible peak flow/flooding impacts.*

See B.3.a.14.

b. Ground Water:

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. **No.**
- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve. **None.**
- 3) *Is there a water resource use (public, domestic, agricultural, hatchery, etc.), or area of slope instability, downstream or down slope of the proposed activity that could be affected by changes in groundwater amounts, timing, or movements as a result this proposal?*
☒No ☐Yes, describe:
- a) *Note protection measures, if any.*

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.
- Snowmelt and rain are the main sources of water runoff. Runoff that is intercepted by road surfaces and ditches will be diverted onto the undisturbed forest floor where possible.**
- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.
- Waste material is not expected to enter ground or surface waters.**
- a) *Note protection measures, if any.*

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:

See surface water, ground water, and water runoff sections above, questions B-3-a-1-c, B-3-a-16, B-3-b-3-a, and B-3-c-2-a.

4. Plants

a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

- ☒deciduous tree: ☐alder, ☒maple, ☐aspen, ☐cottonwood, ☐western larch, ☐birch, ☐other:
- ☒evergreen tree: ☒Douglas fir, ☒grand fir, ☐Pacific silver fir, ☒ponderosa pine, ☐lodgepole pine,
☐western hemlock, ☐mountain hemlock, ☐Englemann spruce, ☐Sitka spruce,
☐red cedar, ☐yellow cedar, ☐other:
- ☒shrubs: ☐huckleberry, ☐salmonberry, ☐salal, ☐other: vine maple
- ☒grass
- ☐pasture
- ☐crop or grain
- ☐wet soil plants: ☐cattail, ☐buttercup, ☐bullrush, ☐skunk cabbage, ☐devil's club, ☐other:
- ☐water plants: ☐water lily, ☐eelgrass, ☐milfoil, ☐other:
- ☐other types of vegetation:
- ☐plant communities of concern:

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered? (See answers to questions A-11-a, A-11-b, B-3-a-1-b and B-3-a-1-c. The following sub-questions merely supplement those answers.)

- 1) *Describe the species, age, and structural diversity of the timber types immediately adjacent to the removal area. (See landscape/WAU and adjacency maps on the DNR website at: <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under "SEPA Center.")*

Unit #1:

North and South of unit: Stands of variable timber, ranging from 25 to 100+ years old. The stands are dominated by Douglas-fir and grand fir.

East of unit: A portion of the eastern boundary is adjacent to a regeneration harvest unit logged approximately 5 years ago. Unit has been planted with Douglas-fir seedlings, and is currently about 3.5 feet in height. The other portion of the eastern boundary is adjacent to a stand of timber approximately 100+ years old, dominated by Douglas-fir and grand fir.

West of unit: A portion of the western boundary is adjacent to a regeneration harvest unit logged approximately 5 years ago. The unit has been planted with Douglas-fir seedlings, and is currently about 3.5 feet in height. The other portion of the western boundary is adjacent to a stand of timber approximately 50-80 years old and is dominated by Douglas-fir and grand fir.

Unit #2:

North, East, and West of unit: Stands of mature timber, dominated by Douglas-fir and scattered grand fir 80+ years old.

South of unit: A regeneration harvest unit of approximately 40 acres, harvested within the last year.

2) *Retention tree plan:*

Within proposed Units #1 and #2, approximately 6-11 trees will be left per acre. Preference will be given to large diameter Douglas-fir but will include some scattered grand fir individuals.

- c. List threatened or endangered *plant* species known to be on or near the site. **None.**
- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any: **None.**

5. Animal

- a. Circle or check any birds animals *or unique habitats* which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

birds: ☒hawk, ☐heron, ☐eagle, ☒songbirds, ☐pigeon, ☐other: raven

mammals: ☒deer, ☒bear, ☐elk, ☐beaver, ☐other:

fish: ☐bass, ☐salmon, ☐trout, ☐herring, ☐shellfish, ☐other:

unique habitats: ☐talus slopes, ☐caves, ☐cliffs, ☐oak woodlands, ☐balds, ☐mineral springs

- b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site (*include federal- and state-listed species*).

This Forest Practice is within the Status 1 Owl Management Circle (#735-Mill Creek-Rattlesnake), however, the Klickitat District of the WADNR is operating under the guidelines for the Klickitat Scattered Sub-Landscape set forth in the HCP Amendment #1 for the Klickitat Planning Unit dated April of 2004. This proposal is located on land designated as DFC/No Role and is in compliance with the aforementioned amendment. The nest is currently unoccupied, and is outside of this proposal area.

- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.
☒Pacific flyway ☐Other migration route: *Explain if any boxes checked:*

This site is part of the Pacific Flyway, but is not used extensively for resting or feeding by waterfowl.

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

1) *Note existing or proposed protection measures, if any, for the complete proposal described in question A-11.*

Species /Habitat: **Snag dependent species**

Protection Measures: **Units #1 - 11 trees per acre and Unit #2 - 6 trees per acre will be left across all diameters, including Douglas-fir and grand fir. Trees selected for retention will provide wildlife habitat function within the future stand. Existing snags will be retained wherever possible.**

Species /Habitat: **Small mammal/amphibian**

Protection Measures: **Large down wood will be increased on the forest floor.**

6. Energy and Natural Resources

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc. **None.**
- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe. **No.**
- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any: **None.**

7. Environmental Health

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

The proposal area pays forest patrol assessment to the DNR for wildfire suppression.

2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

Pile burning may occur at landings to reduce fuel loading.

- b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

None.

- 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from this site.
- During the road construction, maintenance, and harvest activities, there will be some noise associated with heavy equipment, chain saws, and log truck operations.**
- 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:
- Noise levels are not expected to result in significant impact. Therefore, no mitigating measures are planned.**

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? (*Site includes the complete proposal, e.g. rock pits and access roads.*)
- The site is currently used for timber production, and dispersed recreational activities such as hunting, wood cutting, and hiking.**
- b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe. **The site may have been used for cattle grazing.**
- c. Describe any structures on the site. **None.**
- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what? **No.**
- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site? **Forest Resource.**
- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site? **Not applicable.**
- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site? **Not applicable.**
- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an “environmentally sensitive” area? If so, specify. **No.**
- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project? **None.**
- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace? **None.**
- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any: **None.**
- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:
- This proposal shall maintain and/or enhance compatibility with existing and projected land uses such as timber production, grazing, dispersed recreational activities and use by wildlife for forage, roosting, travel, and cover.**

9. Housing

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing. **None.**
- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing. **None.**
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any: **None.**

10. Aesthetics

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principle exterior building material(s) proposed?
- Not applicable.**
- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?
- 1) *Is this proposal visible from a residential area, town, city, developed recreation site, or a scenic vista?*
☒No ☐Yes, viewing location:
- 2) *Is this proposal visible from a major transportation or designated scenic corridor (county road, state or interstate highway, US route, river, or Columbia Gorge SMA)?*
☒No ☐Yes, scenic corridor name:
- 3) *How will this proposal affect any views described in 1) or 2) above?*
- Not applicable.**
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any: **None.**

11. Light and Glare

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur? **None.**
- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views? **None.**

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal? **None.**
- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any: **None.**

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?
Hunting, hiking, snowmobiling, bird watching, mountain biking, horseback riding.
- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe:
During harvest operations, areas of the timber sale and haul routes will be unsafe for recreation use due to timber harvesting operations.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:
Signing to warn of hazards associated with timber harvest and truck traffic.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe. **None.**
- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site. **None.**
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:
(Include all meetings or consultations with tribes, archaeologists, anthropologists or other authorities.)
A cultural resources survey of the site has been conducted by the WADNR's archeologist. Should any cultural resources be identified within the sale boundaries during timber harvest, work will cease in that area, a professional archaeologist will be notified immediately, and a site protection plan will be developed.

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.
The haul route will most likely be along the Sleepy Hollow and Lyle-Snowden county roads.
1) Is it likely that this proposal will contribute to an existing safety, noise, dust, maintenance, or other transportation impact problem(s)?
There will be some temporary increase in log truck traffic and dust along roads during the project.
- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop? **No.**
- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate? **None.**
- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).
Yes. Existing forest roads will be used for the purpose of forest management activities and all DNR managed roads will be maintained at Forest Practice standards.
1) How does this proposal impact the overall transportation system/circulation in the surrounding area, if at all?
This proposal should have no significant impact on the current transportation system. Any impact will be temporary, and limited to the period of time during which operations are conducted.
- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe. **No.**
- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.
During operations, between 10 and 20 loads of logs will be hauled each day.
- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:
Log hauling will not be permitted from November 1 to April 30 due to the wet weather season.

15. Public Services

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe. **No.**
- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any. **None.**

16. **Utilities**

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other. **None.**

- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed. **None.**

C. **SIGNATURE**

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Completed by:	<div>SAM GRIMM, District Forester</div>	Date:
Reviewed by:	<div>PETER T. STOCKS, District Manager</div>	Date:
Reviewed by:	<div>CHARLIE McKINNEY, Proprietary Forester</div>	Date:
Approved by:	<div>GEORGE B. SHELTON, Assistant Region Manager</div>	Date: